

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/605,074	09/06/2003	Igor V. Touzov	2073	
34185	7590 09/22/2005		EXAMINER	
IGOR V TOUZOV			NORTON, JENNIFER L	
311 CASTLE CARY, NC 2	HAYNE DRIVE 27519		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2121	
			DATE MAILED: 09/22/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Diccs.074 TOUZOV, IGOR V.		Application No.	Applicant(s)
All Participants: Status of Application: panding (1) Jennifer L. Norton. (3)	Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/605,074	TOUZOV, IGOR V.
All Participants: (1) Jennifer L. Norton. (2) Dr. Igor V. Touzoy. (3)	Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
(1) Jennifer L. Norton. (2) Dr. Igor V. Toużov. (3)		Jennifer L. Norton	2121
Date of Interview: 7 September 2005 Time: 3:17 p.m. Type of Interview: Yelephonic Tideo Conference Applicant Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes If Yes	All Participants:	Status of Application: per	nding
Type of Interview:	(1) <u>Jennifer L. Norton</u> .	(3)	
Type of Interview: Telephonic Video Conference Applicant Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No If Yes, provide a brief description: Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: N/A Claims discussed: 1-20 Prior art documents discussed: N/A Part II. Substance of Interview Describing THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The examiner contacted Dr. Igor V. Touzov regarding insufficient funds and informalities in the oath/declaration: 1) improper electronic signature and 2) clizenship abbreviation, and 3) no meiting address. Applicant requested all informalities in writing. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.	(2) <u>Dr. Igor V. Touzov</u> .	(4)	
Telephonic disconference Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No If Yes, provide a brief description: Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: N/A Rejection(s) discussed: 1-20 Prior and documents discussed: N/A Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The examiner contacted Dr. Igor V. Touzov regarding insufficient funds and informalities in the oath/declaration: 1) improper electronic signature and 2) citizenship abbreviation, and 3) no mailing address. Applicant requested all informalities in writing. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.	Date of Interview: 7 September 2005	Time: <u>3:17 p.m.</u>	
Rejection(s) discussed: N/A Claims discussed: 1-20 Prior art documents discussed: N/A Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The examiner contacted Dr. Igor V. Touzor regarding insufficient funds and informalities in the oath/declaration: 1) improper electronic signature and 2) citizenship abbreviation, and 3) no mailing address. Applicant requested all informalities in writing. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.	 ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicat Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No 	ant's representative)	
Claims discussed: 1-20 Prior art documents discussed: N/A Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The examiner contacted Dr. Igor V. Touzov regarding insufficient funds and informalities in the oath/declaration; 1) improper electronic signature and 2) citizenship abbreviation, and 3) no malling address. Applicant requested all informalities in writing. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.	Part I.	•	•
Prior art documents discussed: N/A Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The examiner contacted Dr. Igor V. Touzov regarding insufficient funds and informalities in the oath/decleration: 1) improper electronic signature and 2) citizenship abbreviation, and 3) no mailing address. Applicant requested all informalities in writing. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.	•		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The examiner contacted Dr. Igor V. Touzov regarding insufficient funds and informalities in the oath/declaration: 1) improper electronic signature and 2) citizenship abbreviation, and 3) no mailing address. Applicant requested all informalities in writing. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.		·.	
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The examiner contacted Dr. Igor V. Touzov regarding insufficient funds and informalities in the oath/declaration: 1) improper electronic signature and 2) citizenship abbreviation, and 3) no mailing address. Applicant requested all informalities in writing. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.			
The examiner contacted Dr. Igor V. Touzov regarding insufficient funds and informalities in the oath/declaration: 1) improper electronic signature and 2) citizenship abbreviation, and 3) no mailing address. Applicant requested all informalities in writing. Part III. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.	Part II.	•	
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 	The examiner contacted Dr. Igor V. Touzov regarding insufficient	t funds and informalities in the oat	h/declaration; 1) improper
directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.	Part III.		
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)	directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate r	e examiner will provide a writted ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)	•		
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)			
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)		•	
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)			
Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)			
	(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant	/Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – if appropriate)

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
 - (The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

DATE MAILED:

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
10/605,074	6 September 2	2003 Dr. Igar Tous	ZOY	EXAMINER JEHNIFER L. Norton	
			Jan		
			ART UNIT	PAPER	
			ZIZI	20050908	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Per request of the inventor for written documentation regarding insufficient funds and informalities in the oath/declaration of Application No.: 10/605,074, entitled "Optimized calibration data based methods for parallel digital feedback, and digital automation controls".

1. Insufficient Funds

There are 9 nine independent claims, (nos.: 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, and 17-20). The inventor has paid for 2 additional independent claims in excess of 3. Fees are owed for 4 additional independent claims at \$100.00 each, which is a total of \$400.00 for 4 claims.

2. Informalities in the Oath/Declaration

a) The signature on the electronic oath/declaration filed on September 6, 2003 is improper. An electronic signature should have the inventor's full name, including middle initial if applicable, inserted between two single forward slashes.

Ex. /John T. Smith/

b) The inventor failed to disclose the name of the country of citizenship. As defined by MPEP 1.61, an oath/declaration filed under MPEP 1.51(b)(2) as part of a nonprovisional application must:

Identify the country of citzenship for each inventor.

c) The inventor failed to disclose his mailing address on the oath/declaration as defined by MPEP1.61. Unless information is supplied on an application data sheet in accordance with MPEP 1.76, the oath or declaration must also identify:

The mailing address, and residence if an inventor lives at a location which is different from where the inventor customarily recieves mail.

The applicant is given a TIME PERIOD of ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Anthony Knight

PTO-90C (Rev.04-03)

Supervisory Patent Examiner Group 3600